

BASIS FOR THE AMENDMENT

Claim 5 and 13 have been canceled. The limitations of Claim 5 have been included in Claim 1 and 12.

New Claims 21-38 have been added as supported by Claims 2-20 as originally filed.

New Claim 21 is supported by Claims 1 and 8 as originally filed.

New Claim 31 is supported by Claim 12 and Claim 8 as originally filed.

No new matter is believed to have been added by entry of this amendment. Entry and favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment Claims 1-4, 6-38 will now be active in this application.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Nam for the helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on January 27, 2006. During this discussion it was noted that Claims 6-10 as presently amended appear to overcome the claim objections. Regarding the phrase "an exposed portion", the Examiner appeared to be willing to accept the argument referring to pages 41 and 42 of the specification.

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Nam for indicating allowability of Claim 5-10 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The limitations of allowable Claim 5 have been included in Claims 1 and 12. The limitations of allowable Claim 8 have been included in new Claims 21 and 31. Thus, all claims should be allowable over the prior art of record.

The objection to Claim 6 is obviated by the amendment of Claim 6.

The rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, is traversed. The phrase “an exposed portion” is discussed in detail at pages 41 and 42 of the specification. For example, the specification discloses “The exposed portion is higher in content of the conductive material and in density as compared with the portion of the inter-penetrating structure.” See page 41, lines 15-18. In view of the description in the specification the phrase “an exposed portion” can be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.


This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants’ below-signed

representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850


Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297